

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JEROME L. GRIMES,

Plaintiff,

v.

LOPEZ, et al.,

Defendants.

No. C 14-2899 JSW (PR)

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

---

Plaintiff, an inmate in the San Francisco County Jail and frequent litigator in this Court, has recently filed this pro se civil rights case. On May 18, 2000, this Court informed Plaintiff that under the "three-strikes" provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) he generally is ineligible to proceed *in forma pauperis* in federal court with civil actions filed while he is incarcerated. *See Grimes v. Oakland Police Dept.*, C 00-1100 CW (Order Dismissing Complaint, 5/18/00). Since then, Plaintiff has continued to file hundreds of civil rights actions seeking *in forma pauperis* status. With respect to each action filed, the Court conducts a preliminary review to assess the nature of the allegations and to determine whether Plaintiff alleges facts which bring him within the "imminent danger of serious physical injury" exception to § 1915(g). In the past, Plaintiff has routinely been granted leave to amend to pay the full filing fee and to state cognizable claims for relief, but he has habitually failed to do so. For example, in 2003 alone Plaintiff's failure to comply resulted in the dismissal of approximately thirty-six actions under § 1915(g).

1 In accord with this ongoing practice, the Court has reviewed the allegations in the  
2 present action and finds that Plaintiff alleges no facts which bring him within the  
3 “imminent danger” clause. The complaint makes the same highly implausible and  
4 sometimes unintelligible allegations he has made in many of his prior cases, such as  
5 “illegal tracking device terror intent and imp. chip terror” and “1976 gang rape of Diana  
6 Grimes” and “1980 Olympic West Coast Airplane Bombing.” He also claims that he  
7 received a traffic citation for being a “whistle blower of gang rapes,” which is not  
8 cognizable under Section 1983. Plaintiff has been informed on numerous occasions that  
9 allegations and claims such as these do not establish imminent danger nor do they state  
10 cognizable claims for relief. Therefore, it would be futile to grant Plaintiff leave to  
11 amend.

12 Accordingly, this case is DISMISSED without prejudice under § 1915(g). If  
13 Plaintiff is so inclined, he may bring his claims in a new action accompanied by the  
14 \$400.00 filing fee. In any event, the Court will continue to review under § 1915(g) all  
15 future actions filed by Plaintiff while he is incarcerated in which he seeks *in forma*  
16 *pauperis* status.

17 The Clerk of the Court shall close the file and terminate all pending motions.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 DATED: August 8, 2014

20   
21 JEFFREY S. WHITE  
22 United States District Judge  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JEROME GRIMES,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAN MATEO SHERIFF OFFICER LOPEZ et  
al,

Defendant.

Case Number: CV14-02899 JSW

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

That on August 8, 2014, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.

Jerome L. Grimes 14669977  
SF#408761  
263 Vernon Street  
San Francisco, CA 94132

Dated: August 8, 2014



Richard W. Wieking, Clerk  
By: Jennifer Ottolini, Deputy Clerk